



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/542,763

01/17/2006

Oleg Stenzel

274674US0PCT

9218

22850

7590

06/04/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PARVINI, PEGAH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/542,763	Applicant(s) STENZEL ET AL.	
	Examiner JERRY A. LORENZO	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JERRY A. LORENZO.

(3) Pegah Parvini.

(2) Frederick Vastine.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-9, 16, 17 and 19-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. patent Nos. 5,846,506 to Esch et al. and 6,180,076 to Urlandt et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiners and Mr. Vastine discussed the instant invention with regards to the claimed Sears and BET values and their ratio as compared to the prior art. Mr. Vastine argued that though there may be overlap in the ranges, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be directed to the prior art. The Examiner's indicated that they would re-evaluate the prior art rejection in view of a formal filing to the outstanding non-final office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jerry Lorenzo/ SPE AU 1793

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required